

Technical Memorandum

ADA 026902

Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction



NUMBER 39

DATE MARCH 1976

REVISION OF THE
ENLISTED EVALUATION REPORT
(DA FORM 2166-4, 1 Jul 70)

DDC
Distribution
JUL 13 1976
A

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

US ARMY ENLISTED RECORDS
AND EVALUATION CENTER

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis, Indiana 46249

Project # 923

This page is unclassified

Best Available Copy

**Best
Available
Copy**

Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction

Technical Memorandum No. 39

14 TM-39

REVISION OF THE ENLISTED EVALUATION REPORT

DA Form 2166-4, 1 July 1970.
Revision.

By

William W. Wance,
Arthur G. Hermansen,
Herman A. Mahnen
Clay V. Brittain

Submitted by

PETER G. JONES
LTC, ADA
Chief, Evaluation & Research Div

Approved by

ROBERT R. SERRA
Colonel, AGC
Commanding

ACCESSION NO.	
NTIS	White Section <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DDC	Buff Section <input type="checkbox"/>
UNANNOUNCED <input type="checkbox"/>	
JUSTIFICATION	
BY	
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODE	
Dist.	AVAIL AND USE
A	

16 DA-923

12 74p.

11 May 1976

Copy available to DDC does not
permit fully legible reproduction

TM 39

HB

409 759

CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
BACKGROUND	3
Army Enlisted Evaluation System	3
Prior Rating Forms	3
Inception of Present Revision	5
Guidance	5
DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY VERSIONS OF THE FORMS	6
FIELD TRIAL	22
Field Trial Procedure	22
Field Trial Results	26
DISCUSSION	47
REVISION	50
IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW FORMS	51
TABLES	
Table 1 Chronological History of Enlisted Rating Forms in the Enlisted Evaluation System	3
Table 2 Statistical Comparison of EER (1 Jul 70) Form Scores	4
Table 3 Statements Enlisted Soldiers Used Most Frequently to Describe Job Proficiency of Their Peers	9
Table 4 Key Words for Job Performance Traits	4
Table 5 Phrases Describing Job Performance Traits	5
Table 6 Job Performance Trait Ranking Data	15
Table 7 Key Word Symbols and Narrative Trait Definitions on Final Approved EER Form	16

TM 39

	Page
Table 8 Scoring Weight Assignments	21
Table 9 Field Trial Locations	23
Table 10 Sampling Plan	24
Table 11 Listing of Administrative Materials	25
Table 12 Completed Field Trial Materials Returned	27
Table 13 Number of Field Trial Ratings Computer Processed	28
Table 14 Percentage of EER/SEER Forms with Errors on Top (Opscan) Sheet	29
Table 15 Degree of Soldier Contact on Which Ratings Were Based - EER and SEER	30
Table 16 Statistical Comparison of EER (1 Jul 70 Form) Scores and Field Trial EER/SEER Scores	31
Table 17 Comparison of Variances for Duty Performance Traits on the Field Trial EER (Raters Only)	33
Table 18 Scores on Demonstrated Overall Performance (EER)	34
Table 19 Scores on Advancement Potential (EER)	35
Table 20 Comparison of Variances for Performance Qualities on the Field Trial SEER (Raters Only)	37
Table 21 Comparison of Variances for Leadership Skills on the Field Trial SEER (Raters Only)	38
Table 22 Scores on Mission Accomplishment - SEER	39
Table 23 Scores on Advancement Potential - SEER	40
Table 24 Summary of Statistical Differences Between Rater and Indorser Ratings on the EER	41
Table 25 Summary of Statistical Differences Between Rater and Indorser Ratings on the SEER	43
Table 26 Intercorrelation of Job Performance Traits (EER)	44

	Page
Table 27 Intercorrelations Between Areas on SEER (Rater)	45
Table 28 Intercorrelations Between Major Areas on SEER (Indorser)	45
Table 29 Intercorrelations Between Major Areas on SEER (Combined)	45
Table 30 Rank Order of Three Best Leadership Skills-SEER	46
Figure 1 Sample MOS Performance Comments Sheet	8
APPENDICES	
Appendix A EER (DA Form 2166-4, 1 Jul 70)	52
Appendix B Field Trial EER	53
Appendix C Field Trial SEER	55
Appendix D Final Approved EER	57
Appendix E Final Approved SEER	59
Appendix F DA Pamphlet 623-1	61
REFERENCES	
DISTRIBUTION	69
	70

SUMMARY

A revised Enlisted Evaluation Form (EER) to be used in rating soldiers in pay grades E-5 or below, and a Senior Enlisted Evaluation Report (SEER) to be used in rating soldiers in pay grades E5 through E9, were developed along with a revised and updated reporting system.

The primary objectives were to:

- (1) Curb the inflation occurring with use of the current form;
- (2) Provide more objective and open ratings of enlisted soldiers;
- (3) Improve and update the administrative procedures of the enlisted rating system;
- (4) Provide more complete and useable information to Army personnel managers;
- (5) Enable the supervisor and rated soldier to communicate with each other better concerning duty performance status and improvement.

Based on personnel management requirements, findings from a review of related research literature, a study of the rating forms currently being used by the other services, and research on the Army's current and previous rating forms, two field trial forms were developed. These forms were reviewed and approved by the Enlisted Personnel Directorate (EPD), Military Personnel Center (MILPERCEN), and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCS PER). A field test was conducted at eight major Army installations, four headquarters locations, and four Army National Guard (ARNG) and Army Reserve (ARCOM) locations. A total of 3290 enlisted soldiers in pay grades E3 through E9 were rated using the field-trial forms. In addition, structured questionnaire responses and open-ended comments were solicited from the soldiers who performed the trial ratings as well as from the soldiers who were rated.

The rating forms were revised based on the field trial findings. These revised forms were reviewed in the Enlisted Personnel Directorate, MILPERCEN, DCS PER, and the US Army Institute of Administration (USAIA). They were also reviewed by members of a promotion board meeting at Fort Harrison. Final briefings were then given to the Vice Chief of Staff and Chief of Staff of the Army. The new forms were implemented on 1 October 1975. *and the new*

The new Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER) is given at Appendix D, the Senior Enlisted Evaluation Report (SEER) at Appendix E, and the pamphlet covering the "Preparation of Enlisted Evaluation Reports" at Appendix F.

INTRODUCTION

The project reported here involved the extensive revision of the Enlisted Evaluation Report. New rating forms were implemented on 1 October 1975. Prior to implementation of the new forms, a single form had been used for supervisory ratings on enlisted soldiers at all grade levels. The new forms are an Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER) for use in rating soldiers in pay grades up to and including E-5 and a Senior Enlisted Evaluation Report (SEER) for use in rating soldiers in pay grades E6 through E9.

This report describes the development, field testing, revision, and implementation of these new evaluation forms.

BACKGROUND

Army Enlisted Evaluation System. In the Army Enlisted Evaluation System, the soldier's Evaluation Score is a particularly important index which affects a variety of personnel management decisions (e.g., promotion, reclassification, retention in the Army). The evaluation score usually is derived from two components: a score on an MOS proficiency test (or tests if a performance test is given) and a score based upon ratings by the soldier's supervisor.

Prior Rating Forms. Since the inception of the Enlisted Evaluation System in 1958, the form used by supervisors in evaluating soldiers has undergone a number of revisions. Table 1 lists Army rating reports by title and effective dates.

TABLE 1

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF ENLISTED RATING FORMS IN THE ENLISTED EVALUATION SYSTEM

TITLE	PERIOD OF USE
COMMANDER'S EVALUATION REPORT DA Form 2166, 1 Oct 58	1 Jan 59 - 31 Mar 63
COMMANDER'S EVALUATION REPORT DA Form 2166, 1 Apr 63	1 Apr 63 - 31 Mar 68
ENLISTED EFFICIENCY REPORT DA Form 2166, 1 Apr 68	1 Apr 68 - 31 Dec 70
ENLISTED EFFICIENCY REPORT DA Form 2166-4, 1 Jul 70	1 Jan 71 - 30 Sep 75

The recurring periodic revisions of rating forms in large measure represent attempts to counter inflationary trends in supervisory ratings. With the passing of time following implementation of a new rating form, supervisory ratings show an upward trend so pronounced as to impair their usefulness in personnel decisions on soldiers, especially those in the senior enlisted grades. Data from the EER which was superseded on 1 October 1975 illustrate the inflationary trends in EER scores. The total possible score on this form was 125. In Table 2, pay-grade means and standard deviations are shown for January 1971 and August 1974. The scores show that inflation at the higher pay grades is very pronounced. This inflation is indicated by the much smaller spread of scores (standard deviation) for the E-7 through E-9's than for the E-3 through E-6 pay grades. A much higher percentage of the upper pay grade soldiers get maximum (125 point) scores.

TABLE 2
STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF EER
(1 Jul 1970 Form) SCORES

PAY GRADE	EER (1 Jul 1970 Form)			
	Jan 1971 Data		Aug 1974 Data	
	MEAN	SD (σ)	MEAN	SD (σ)
E9	119.5	11.9	123.4	4.4
E8	116.0	14.9	122.6	5.7
E7	108.0	19.2	120.4	8.5
E6	97.4	23.8	117.5	12.2
E5	86.3	26.3	112.7	15.7
E4	75.5	28.4	106.5	21.7
E3	63.3	32.7	88.6	28.4

The decision to develop new evaluation forms also reflected concern about certain specific deficiencies in the old form. These were as follows:

1. The numerical value of the rating directly reflected the judgment of only one rater - the immediate supervisor. The rating procedure routinely provided for a reviewer, but the only sure means by which the reviewer could affect the evaluation was by formal disagreement with the rater. This was rarely done and then only in cases of extreme differences of opinion between the rater and reviewer.
2. The space provided for comments was too limited. The rater was required to comment about the soldier's support of the Army's Equal Opportunity Program and, for soldiers in pay grade E6 and above, about the potential to be an effective First Sergeant. There was little space for any additional comments.
3. The characteristics on which the soldier was to be rated were identified only by general and rather abstract labels and left great latitude for interpretation by the rater.
4. After the form was implemented in 1970, a number of mandatory entries were added. Two have been mentioned - the soldier's support of the EEP program and First Sergeant potential. Another requirement superimposed on the form, was that the soldier sign a statement acknowledging receipt of a copy of the completed report. These changes were implemented without modification of the form, and there was a high incidence of failure to comply with requirements. Many forms received at the EEC had to be returned to the point of origin for correction.

Inception of Present Revision

In 1972, on the assumption that the current EER (see Appendix A) would in a relatively short period of time outlive its usefulness, the USAEEC submitted a revision proposal to the then Commander of OPO (now the Army Military Personnel Center - MILPERCEN).

In 1973, OPO tasked EPD, and in turn EEC, to begin work on a new EER.

Guidance

Major General Berry, then Chief of OPO, directed that the EER be revised and issued the following guidelines for the development of a new evaluation form.

1. Provide for consideration of the "whole man."
2. Simplify administrative procedures.
3. Consider requirements posed by ADP.

4. Parallel OER (officer efficiency rating) system to extent possible.
5. Consider eliminating "efficiency" from the title.

DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY VERSIONS OF THE FORMS

In undertaking the project, a work group was formed in the USAECC and given major responsibility for revising the rating form. An Ad Hoc Committee also was established by the Army Military Personnel Center (MILPERCEN) to study the Enlisted Efficiency Rating System and offer suggestions for its improvement. Various Army field locations provided suggestions for rating system improvement. To gather background information concerning rating form development and use, the Air Force and Navy Enlisted Rating Forms and the Army Officer Evaluation Report System were carefully studied. The work group at USAECC also carefully reviewed the technical literature on psychological rating forms and examined previous Army rating systems. To gather background information concerning leadership skills, the work group examined the Army Officer Efficiency Report (OER), the enlisted rating forms used by the other military services, leadership training materials, and leadership evaluation forms used by civilian business and industry.

A major issue requiring early resolution was the question of a single form for all enlisted grades versus separate junior and senior forms. Administrative simplicity argued for the single form. However, the issue was resolved in favor of two forms. There seemed to be compelling arguments for this option. The major reasons were:

1. Soldiers in the senior enlisted grades are normally in leadership or supervisory positions, so their ratings should logically include an evaluation of traits associated with leadership.
2. Senior enlisted soldiers (E6 and above) can be given additional status and prestige by having a rating form different from the one used for soldiers in the lower grades.
3. Inclusion on a single form of all performance traits needed to evaluate all pay grades would probably result in having certain traits scored for soldiers only in certain grades. This would produce a complex scoring procedure.

In developing the preliminary versions of the forms, the questions which were posed to the USAECC work group tended to fall sequentially into 3 categories: content, scoring, and format.

In terms of rating content, the problem was that of identifying the traits or characteristics to be included on the rating form(s) and phrasing descriptions at levels of specificity. The EER (DA Form 2166-4, 1 Jul 70) previously contained two major rating blocks entitled (1) Characteristics and (2) Advancement Potential (see Appendix A). The Characteristics block had six separate traits for rating. One trait was titled Duty Performance. This in reality was an overall performance or summarization type of rating covering the other five characteristics. To comply with the guideline for adopting the "whole man"

concept in performance rating, the work group decided to enter overall performance as a separate rating block on the field trial form. This block was titled "Demonstrated Overall Performance in Present Duty Position". Therefore, three major rating blocks appeared on the field trial forms:

1. Job Performance Traits
2. Demonstrated Overall Performance in Present Duty Position
3. Advancement Potential

The preliminary listing of the ten Job Performance Traits for the Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER - E1 through E6 - see Appendix B) was developed in the following manner:

1. Soldiers at various Army field installations were asked to provide information on performance characteristics which they believed to be important in identifying above-average soldiers. The instructions to the soldiers and sample statements given by a soldier are shown in Figure 1.
2. From the comment sheets (as shown in Figure 1), a list of statements was prepared showing how soldiers describe "above average" performance of their peers. These statements are listed in Table 3 in order of frequency of being mentioned.
3. The statements given in Table 3, the previous EER forms and research reports, and the rating forms developed by the Navy and the Air Force were used to develop a list of key words which identify and label traits hypothesized as important to duty performance (see Table 4).
4. Performance statements were selected from Table 3 to best fit each key word listed in Table 4. Table 5 gives this matching of key words and performance statements.
5. Groups of soldiers and a group of USAEEC psychologists were asked to rank order the performance statements for each key word shown in Table 5. The highest ranked statement for each key word (by separate rating groups) is given in Table 6.
6. The data given in Table 6 were used as the base for developing the Job Performance Traits used on the field trial version of the EER (see Appendix B (1)).
7. Table 7 gives the listing of the Duty Performance Traits as they appear on the final Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER) form for comparison with the initial listing given in Table 6.

FIGURE 1
SPECIMEN MOS PERFORMANCE COMMENTS SHEET

1.	PMOS <u>11R4H</u>	Name <u>BOST JESSIE L.</u> (Print last name first)
	SSAN <u>444-46-0014</u>	Grade <u>SSG E6</u> Time in PMOS (months) <u>93 months</u>
<p>2. a. List below in short phrases or sentences in your own words the most outstanding things an "above average" soldier does in performing the duties required for your PMOS. These can be personal characteristics (for example, "does not waste time") or PMOS technical characteristics (for example, "makes mechanical adjustments to the antenna without error"), or both types of characteristics.</p> <p>* Look for work to be done. Doesn't need to be superiored all the time. Doesn't complain about work. Help other people slow at learning. Take care of personnel equipment.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>b. List below in short phrases or sentences in your own words the most frequent things a "below average" or poor performing soldier does in performing the duties required for your PMOS. These can be personal characteristics (for example, "aims just to 'get by'") or PMOS technical characteristics (for example, "usually has arithmetic errors on his supply requisitions"), or both types of characteristics.</p> <p>* Want obey orders. Hard to get along with. Might take drug. Want maintain military bearing.</p> <p>3. List below in short phrases or sentences in your own words the <u>most important</u> things an "above average" soldier does or believes which indicate that he is an all-around "good soldier" (for example, "has excellent attitude about the Army as a career").</p> <p>Maintain Military Bearing "Hair Cut" "Boots Shimed" "ETC" Doe work properly and doesn't complain.</p>		

*Comments by the soldier were typed as written.

TABLE 3

STATEMENTS ENLISTED SOLDIERS USE MOST FREQUENTLY TO DESCRIBE
JOB PROFICIENCY OF THEIR PEERS

- Good attitude toward people
- Takes (accepts) responsibility
- Seeks opportunity to better himself
- Makes good use of his time
- Takes an interest in his work
- Excellent attitude toward the Army
- Looks for improvement in his job
- Sets high standards for himself
- Knows what he is talking about
- Is at proper place on time
- Always trying to be helpful
- Need not be told what to do
- Does more than expected of him
- Takes pride in his work
- Takes orders easily
- Takes time to make work correct the first time
- Performs his work fast but with few errors
- Keeps himself looking like a soldier
- Always alert
- Enjoys his work
- Does the best he can all the time
- Asks questions and reads to find out answers

TABLE 3 CONTINUED:

Does not complain about his work
Neat and orderly in his work area
Is trying to learn
Does job whether he likes it or not
Works for higher goal
Aids co-workers in their job
Puts high importance on safety
Maintains a good general attitude
Always busy at something
Can foresee problems ahead and work them out
Not afraid to make decisions
Knows how to organize his work
Makes quick and sound decisions

TABLE 4

KEY WORDS FOR JOB PERFORMANCE TRAITS

1. Cooperativeness	6. Initiative
2. Reliability	7. Job Knowledge
3. Drive	8. Conduct
4. Application	9. Bearing
5. Development	10. Physical Condition

TABLE 5
PHRASES DESCRIBING JOB PERFORMANCE TRAITS

COOPERATIVENESS

(ability to operate jointly with others)

- Is he successful in working with others?
- Does he take orders easily?
- Does he get along well with his fellow soldiers?
- Does he help others to learn and do their jobs?
- Does he fit in well with the group both during duty and off-duty hours?

- Does he receive and carry out orders willingly?

RELIABILITY

(dependability in performing without supervision)

- Can he be relied upon to stick to the job?
- Can he be relied upon to carry out actions over obstacles that would stop the average man of his grade and MOS?
- Does he do the best he can all the time?
- Must he be told what to do beyond normal amount of supervision or direction giving?
- Does he carry out his orders thoroughly without constant supervision?

TABLE 5 (continued)

DRIVE

(energy devoted to job mastery)

Does he work energetically?

Does he show interest and enthusiasm for his job?

Does he put a lot of effort into his job?

Is he usually busy at something related to his job?

APPLICATION

(willingness to work)

Does he accept and volunteer for extra work?

Does he devote full time and attention to his job and improvement of the work of his group?

Does he do more than is expected of him?

Does he put a little extra into his job?

Does he get right down to work -- easily started?

DEVELOPMENT

(effort directed toward realization of potential)

Does he show potential for rapid development?

Does he seek out opportunities to better himself?

Does he look for improvement in his job?

Does he study on his own time?

Is he trying to get ahead in the Army?

Does he on his own initiative ask questions and read to find out answers?

Is he willing to learn new techniques?

Does he have a higher job goal and work for it?

TABLE 5 (continued)

INITIATIVE

(aggressive pursuit of methods to improve job performance)

Does he suggest better ways of doing jobs?

Is he alert to opportunities to improve his work?

Does he display ability to initiate action without direction from others?

Can he foresee problems ahead and work them out?

Does he on his own initiative promote acceptable new ideas?

JOB KNOWLEDGE

(breadth of knowledge about his job)

Is he well informed on all phases of his work?

Does he know both the routine and the non-routine parts of his job?

Does he know all aspects of his job?

Can he handle most job problems without outside help?

Does he have satisfactory knowledge about all his assigned tasks?

CONDUCT

(management of personal affairs and behavior)

Is his personal behavior a credit to the Army

Does he conduct himself well and manage his personal affairs with full capability?

Does he show behavior becoming of a soldier, have good management of his personal affairs, and meet his financial obligations?

Does his personal behavior set a good example for others?

Is his personal behavior such that he is respected by his fellow workers?

Does he show all-around personal honesty, moral soundness, and uprightness?

TABLE 5 (continued)

BEARING
(posture, neatness of dress and appearance)

- Is he correct and adequate in his dress and bearing?
- Does he conform in appearance to the traditions of the military service?
- Is he usually neat in appearance and military in bearing?
- Does he set high standards for himself in dress and appearance?
- Does he keep himself looking like a soldier?
- Does he take pride in his neatness of dress and appearance?

PHYSICAL CONDITION
(physical capacity to carry out required military duties)

- Is he physically fit to perform duties required of his MOS?
(Ignore temporary medical limitations due to recent illness or accidents)
- Does he put forth effort to attain and/or retain physical fitness required of his MOS?
- Does he actively work at maintaining himself in good physical condition?
- Does he have any physical limitations which would interfere with current MOS or future promotions?

TABLE 6
JOB PERFORMANCE TRAIT RANKING DATA

MAJOR TRAIT AREA	JOB PERFORMANCE TRAIT QUESTIONS	RANKING GROUPS					
		E-3 thru E-5		E-6 thru E-9		EE, Psychologists	
		Rank	N	Rank	N	Rank	N
Cooperativeness	Is the individual successful in working with others?	1	51	1	64	1	17
Reliability	Does the individual carry out his or her orders thoroughly without constant supervision?	1	52	1	65	-	-
Drive	Does the individual show interest and enthusiasm for his or her job?	1	52	1	64	1	18
Application	Does the individual devote full time and attention to his or her job and improvement of the work of his or her group?	1	52	1	66	2	18
Development	Does the individual seek out opportunities to better himself or herself?	1	51	-	65	1	18
Initiative	Does the individual display ability to initiate action without direction from others?	1	51	1	65	1	18
Job Knowledge	Is the individual well informed on all phases of his or her work?	1	50	1	65	1	18
Conduct	Does the individual's personal behavior set a good example for others?	1	52	2	64	1	17
Bearing	Does the individual take pride in his or her neatness and appearance?	1	52	2	65	2	18
Physical Condition	Does the individual actively work at maintaining himself or herself in good physical condition?	1	49	2	53	-	-

TABLE 7

KEY WORD SYMBOLS AND NARRATIVE TRAIT DEFINITIONS
ON FINAL APPROVED EER FORM (see Appendix D)

JOB KNOWLEDGE	1. Is well informed on all phases of assigned duties. (Scope of knowledge about duties)
RELIABILITY	2. Carries out orders without constant supervision. (Dependability in performing without supervision)
DRIVE	3. Shows interest and enthusiasm for duties. (Attitude toward duties)
LEADERSHIP	4. Demonstrates qualities of leadership. (Exerts positive influence on others)
DEVELOPMENT	5. Seeks out opportunities for self improvement. (Effort directed toward realization of potential)
INITIATIVE	6. Displays ability to initiate action without direction from others. (Aggressive pursuit of methods to improve duty performance)
COOPERATIVENESS	7. Is successful in working with others. (Ability to work in harmony with others)
CONDUCT	8. Personal behavior sets a good example for others. (High standards of personal conduct)
BEARING	9. Takes pride in dress and appearance. (Neat and military in bearing)
PHYSIC CONDITION	10. Is physically fit, as required, for MOS/grade during combat. (Physical condition)

For the preliminary form of the Enlisted Evaluation Report (Junior Form) the rating category of "Demonstrated Overall Performance in Present Duty Position" was entered to serve as a global evaluation of overall performance after the rater and indorser had evaluated the soldier on the ten separate Job Performance Traits. The rating category of "Advancement Potential" was retained to serve as an evaluation of the soldier's potential to progress to duties and responsibilities above his present assignment. This was considered to be an important aspect of the "whole man" concept.

There was no previous Army rating form designed specifically for senior enlisted soldiers. Therefore, the major rating blocks and separate qualities and skills within the blocks were derived from insights and suggestions obtained from studying rating forms used by other military services and civilian industry, plus a study of leadership training and evaluation literature. The major rating blocks for the field trial Senior Enlisted Evaluation Report (SEER) form were (see Appendix C (1)):

1. Performance Qualities
2. Performance of Personnel Supervised
3. Leadership Skills
4. Mission Accomplishment
5. Advancement Potential

Seven separate Performance Qualities were selected as being most important and most representative of general performance for senior enlisted soldiers. These separate qualities are (see Appendix C (1)):

1. Judgment
2. Initiative
3. Endurance
4. Appearance
5. Personal Conduct
6. Responsibility
7. Integrity

Next, it was hypothesized that the performance of a soldier in a supervisory position would be reflected in the performance of the soldiers supervised. Therefore, an unscored block was entered on the form titled "Performance of Personnel Supervised" (see Appendix C (1)). This block was left unscored

because it was assumed that the influence of a supervisor is contaminated with many other influences, but that the block gave information for counseling purposes.

The Leadership Skills block was a major addition not included on the previous EER. The seven separate skills to be rated were selected by making a thorough study of the resource materials previously mentioned. The seven skills entered in this block were (see Appendix C (1)).

1. Communications
2. Counseling
3. Training
4. Relations with Subordinates
5. Peer Relations
6. Relations with Superiors
7. Decision Ability

"Mission Accomplishment" (see Appendix C (1)) was entered on the preliminary SEER form in an attempt to have it reflect supervisory performance. Everyone recognizes this as the ultimate outcome of supervisory performance, but rater reaction and ability to rate the factor accurately would determine whether it stayed on the final rating form.

The block titled "Advancement Potential" (see Appendix C (1)) is the counterpart of the one on the EER. Advancement potential is an important aspect of the "whole man" concept, and allows the rater to project future performance based upon present and past performance.

SCORING:

To maintain continuity in the established EER scoring procedures, a total of 125 points was used for both the EER and the SEER forms. One-hundred and thirty enlisted soldiers (E-3 through E-9), at the US Army School of Administration, Fort Benjamin Harrison, were asked to give their reaction as to how the 125 points should be allocated to:

1. Job Performance Traits
2. Demonstrated Overall Performance in Present Duty Position
3. Advancement Potential

Table 8 gives the results of the percentage assignment of points by these 130 enlisted soldiers to the three major rating categories shown above. The right-hand columns titled "Allotted Percentages" and "Allotted Scoring Points" show the average percentage figures rounded and the number of points each rounded percentage is of the 125 total scoring points. This weight assignment was done without particular reference to either the EER or the SEER. For the ten Job Performance Traits on the EER, the 50 score points were distributed equally to the traits (see Appendix B (1)). The other two rating blocks each had a single rating scale covering the total number of score points (see Appendix B (1)).

No attempt was made to assign differential weights to the ten Job Performance Traits of the EER since that would require empirical data obtained from an outside criterion of job performance. Also, it is likely that different MOSs, or at least common-core groups of MOSs, would require different weights dependent upon their variable, inherent duties and tasks.

In assigning number of score points to the SEER major rating categories, the percentage values used for the EER were used as a rough guide. The final version of the SEER (see Appendix E) shows approximately the same distribution of points to major rating categories if "Performance Qualities" and "Leadership Skills" are combined and considered to be the counterpart of "Duty Performance Traits" on the EER.

FORMAT:

Significant aspects of the format of the field trial forms were:

1. Each form was laid out to be as efficient as possible for computer (PSCAN) scoring and for ease of following and use by the raters using the form. (see Appendices B and C).
2. Each form was prepared as a multiple-copy (original and four carbons), carbon-inserted form. Appendices B (1), (2) and C (1), (2) show what was a fold-out sheet for each of the forms. The top sheet (machine scorable) for each form included only the ratee's personal data and the actual rating (scoring) portions (Part I and II) of the report (see Appendices B (1) and C (1)).
3. The Personal Data (Part I) portion of each form was designed for efficient administrative processing and to be compatible with Army Standard Installation/Division Personnel System (SIDPERS) requirements (see Appendices B (1) and C (1)).
4. Part II, Ratings, for each of the forms was designed to provide scoring blocks for both a rater and an indorser (see Appendices B (1) and C (1)).

5. Each of the fold-out portions of the forms was designed to provide adequate space for the rater and indorser to enter comments concerning Career Development, each major rating category of Part I, and Contribution to the Army Equal Opportunity Program (see Appendices B (2) and C (2)).
6. Each of the fold-out portions of the forms was designed to provide space for rater, indorser, reviewer, and rated soldier authentication (see Appendices B (2) and C (2)).

TABLE 8
SCORING WEIGHT ASSIGNMENTS

MAJOR RATING CATEGORY	PERCENTAGE WEIGHT ASSIGNMENTS			ALLOCATED PERCENTAGES (N=130)	ALLOCATED SCORING POINTS (EER)
	E3 ~ E5 (N=63)	E6 ~ E9 (N=67)	Average of Two Groups (N=130)		
JOB PERFORMANCE TRAITS (COMBINED)	37	45	41	40	50
DEMONSTRATED OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN PRESENT DUTY POSITION	36	35	35	35	44
ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL	27	20	24	25	31
TOTALS	100	100	100	100	125

FIELD TRIAL

Field Trial Procedure

The two field trial forms (see Appendices B and C), with accompanying questionnaires, were administered at eight major Army installations, two headquarters locations, and several National Guard and Army Reserve locations in Indiana and Ohio as shown in Table 9.

A sampling procedure was developed to provide a representative sample across pay grades and MOS codes. With an approximate percentage as a guide, the distribution Army-wide of soldiers by pay grade sampling plan given in Table 10 was developed. Soldiers rated were to be spread among all major units on the installation. Twenty-five E6s on each installation were to be rated on both the EER and SEER. (Rating of E6s on both forms was needed to help in determining which form was most appropriate for E6s). At least 20 soldiers at each large installation were to have ratings checked by a reviewer.

An installation action officer was appointed for each installation and headquarters location listed in Table 9. These action officers visited the USAEEC for a briefing on the field trial procedures. Table 11 gives a listing of the administration materials which were prepared for the action officers and their associated field trial personnel. Because of the voluminous nature of these administrative materials, they are not included in this report.

Four civilian Research Psychologists and two field grade officers from the USAEEC visited selected installations while the field trial was in progress to make on-the-spot observations and to answer questions concerning the field trial instructions and guidelines.

Since the second copy of the multiple-copy field trial form was designated for the soldier's Official Military Personnel File Copy, a sample of 25 completed field trial forms (copy 2) was sent to the Enlisted Records Center for evaluation.

The third copy of the multiple-copy field trial forms was designed for the soldier's Career Branch File. Therefore, a sample of 25 completed field trial forms (copy 3) was sent to the Enlisted Personnel Directorate (EPD) for evaluation.

TABLE 9
FIELD TRIAL LOCATIONS

<u>TRADOC INSTALLATIONS</u>	<u>FORS COM INSTALLATIONS</u>
Ft Bliss	Ft Bragg
Ft Gordon	Ft Hood
Ft Knox	Ft Lewis
Ft Lee	Ft S. C. Hunter
<u>HEADQUARTERS LOCATIONS</u>	
Ft Monroe	TRADOC - DCS PER
Ft Leavenworth	CACDC
Ft Sheridan	USAREC
Ft McPherson	FORS COM
ARNG	Indiana & Ohio
ARCOM	Indiana & Ohio

TABLE 10

SAMPLING PLAN

1. Number of soldiers to be rated.

500 from each TRADOC and FORSCOM Installation
2 from each Headquarters location
2 from each ARNG and ARCOM location

2. The distribution of rating at each TRADOC and FORSCOM installation was to be as follows:

E3	25
E4	75
E5	175
E6	150
E7	75
E8	As many as possible
E9	As many as possible

TABLE 11
LISTING OF ADMINISTRATION MATERIALS

1. Field Trial Flowchart
2. Field Trial Materials Distribution Checklist
3. General Instructions for Installation Action Officer
4. General Instructions for Military Personnel Officers
5. General Instructions for the Rater, Indorser, & Reviewer
6. Manual for Preparation & Administration of the Enlisted Evaluation Report (E1-E6)
7. Manual for Preparation & Administration of the Senior Enlisted Evaluation Report (E7 - E9)
8. Enlisted Evaluation Report (EER)
9. Senior Enlisted Evaluation Report (SEER)
10. I. EER Questionnaire (1974 Field Trial) For Completion by Each Rater & Indorser
11. II. SEER Questionnaire (1974 Field Trial) For Completion by Each Rater & Indorser
12. III. EER/SEER Questionnaire (1974 Field Trial) For Completion by Each Rated Soldier
13. IV. EER/SEER Questionnaire (1974 Field Trial) For Completion by Each Reviewer
14. V. EER/SEER Questionnaire (1974 Field Trial) For Completion by Each Military Personnel Officer (MILPO)

Field Trial Results

The numbers of completed forms, questionnaires, and comment sheets returned are shown in Table 12.

Table 13 shows the number of EER and SEER forms which were computer processed for data analysis. Two percent of the EER and eight percent of the SEER forms were unusable for various reasons (e.g., missing data and improperly completed forms). Table 13 also shows the distribution by pay grade of soldiers who were rated in the Field trial. There was a good distribution across PMOS codes and Test Control Officer locations.

Eight-hundred and two (33%) of the EER forms had differences between the encoded score and the computer calculated score. Nearly all of the differences were due to the rounding procedure used for the final score. Two-hundred nineteen (31%) of the SEER forms had score differences for the same reason.

Table 14 gives percentages of EER and SEER forms that had various types of errors on the top (OPSCAN) sheet of the field trial forms. These are administrative errors which were very likely due, in part, to the experimental setting under which the forms were completed. Various adjustments to the forms, improved administrative instructions, and more serious effort by the raters under actual operational conditions should greatly reduce these errors.

Table 15 gives the percentages of ratings, by the rater and indorser, that were based on the various degrees of contact with the soldiers being rated. As expected, the rater, being the first level supervisor, had the most direct contact with the soldiers being rated. The pattern of contact was about the same for the ratings on the EER and those on the SEER.

Both of the field trial forms had a block titled "Indorser Has Not Observed and Cannot Rate Soldier." On the EER, only 2% of the indorsers said they could not rate the soldier. The SEER showed 6.4% for this same item. These data indicated that the established rating plans used by the field trial locations did identify a very high percentage of indorsers as being close enough to the rated soldiers to know how they were performing.

Table 16 gives the average rating scores by pay grades for the previous EER (DA Form 2166-4, 1970) as of 31 August 1974. Also given are the average rating scores for the field trial forms. All of the field trial scores were significantly lower (.01 significance level) than the matching pay grade scores for 31 August 1974. For the 135 E6 soldiers who were rated on both the EER

TABLE 12
COMPLETED FIELD TRIAL MATERIALS RETURNED

		<u>EER</u>	<u>SEER</u>
<u>RATING FORMS ISSUED</u>		3820	1160
<u>RATING FORMS RETURNED</u>		2516	774
<u>QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED:</u>			
	<u>EER</u>	<u>SEER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RATER	1094	370	1464
INDORSER	616	267	883
RATED SOLDIER	2397	415	2812
MPO			16
<u>SOLICITED COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM:</u>			
MILITARY PERSONNEL OFFICERS	- 16		
PROJECT ACTION OFFICERS	- 14		
REVIEWERS	- 99		
<u>UNSOLICITED COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM:</u>			
RATERS/INDORSERS WHO COMPLETED EER QUESTIONNAIRE	- 100		
RATERS/INDORSERS WHO COMPLETED SEER QUESTIONNAIRE	- 48		
USERS OF ADMINISTRATION MANUALS	- 22		
CLASS 3, US ARMY SERGEANTS MAJOR ACADEMY	- 1		

TABLE 13
RATINGS COMPUTER PROCESSED

EER TOTAL 2464		SEER TOTAL 714	
DISTRIBUTION BY:			
PMOSC	TCO	PAY GRADE	
		E2	5
		E3	101
		E4	488
		E5	1021
		E6	849 (EER)
		E6	145 (SEER)
		E7	386
		E8	132
		E9	51
		TOTAL	<u>3178</u>

TABLE 14
 PERCENTAGE OF EER/SEER FORMS
WITH ERRORS ON TOP (OPSCAN) SHEET

LOCATION AND TYPE OF ERROR	EER (N = 2359)	SEER (N = 530)
	% of Forms with Error	% of Forms with Error
Part I, Block H Authorized pay grade not entered	14.0	9.8
Part I, Block C Not blacked in at all or not well	2.5	3.4
Bottom of Top Sheet MPO did not sign	15.3	23.4
Part I, Block M Month and year numerals at left of Opscan area not filled in	53.2	13.8
Part I, Block R Not filled out at all	15.1	17.4
Part II, Scoring Blocks Arithmetic errors	8.5	5.8

TABLE 15

DEGREE OF SOLDIER CONTACT ON WHICH
RATINGS WERE BASED - EER & SEER

DEGREE OF CONTACT	PER CENT OF RATINGS ON EER		PER CENT OF RATINGS ON SEER	
	RATER	INDORSER	RATER	INDORSER
DAILY CONTACT	91.27	62.57	92.86	57.16
FREQUENT OBSERVATION	4.42	27.56	5.32	31.04
INFREQUENT OBSERVATION	1.50	4.79	.42	4.78
REPORTS - RECORDS	.20	.71	.14	.90
NO CHOICE	2.60	4.37	1.26	6.12

TABLE 6

STATISTICAL COMPARISON OF EER (1 Jul 1970 Form)
SCORES AND FIELD TRIAL EER/SEER SCORES

EAV GRADE	EER (1 Jul 1970 Form)		FIELD TRIAL EER/SEER		N
	31 Aug 1974 Data	MEAN	SD (σ)	MEAN	
E9	123.4	4.4	117.3	16.0	51
E8	122.6	5.7	110.8	15.3	132
E7	120.4	8.5	106.0	16.1	386
E6	117.5	12.2	103.4 98.4 *	19.1 19.3	849 145
E5	112.7	15.7	96.9	21.6	1021
E4	106.3	21.7	92.1	22.7	488
E3	88.6	28.4	76.9	28.0	101

* E6s rated on the experimental SEER Form.

and the SEER, there was a correlation of .88 between the two sets of scores. The SEER scores for this group of E6's were significantly lower (.01 significance level) than the EER scores. One-hundred thirteen of the one-hundred thirty-five soldiers rated on both forms were rated lower on the SEER than on the EER. These results suggest some reduction in inflation which has been evident in EER scores.

The field trial rating score and the most recent EER score for each soldier were matched wherever possible. These mean field trial scores also were significantly lower (.01 significance level) for each pay grade.

The differences in total mean scores, for the raters and indorsers for each pay grade, were tested for statistical significance. Only pay grade E5 showed a statistically significant difference (.05 level of confidence).

Table 17 through 19 reflect data on how the EER performed on the ten separate duty performance traits, on Demonstrated Overall Performance, and on Advancement Potential.

Table 17 provides a comparison of the variances for the Duty Performance Traits on the field trial EER. The variances decrease consistently for each trait when going from E3 to E6 ratings.

Table 18 presents a comparison of the means and standard deviations of the rating scores, by pay grade, for the raters and indorsers on Demonstrated Overall Performance (EER). The means increase and the standard deviations decrease with increase in pay grade. The mean scores for the indorsers were lower for each pay grade. For the E3 and E4 pay grades, there is no significant difference between the raters and indorsers; for the E5 and E6 pay grades, they do differ at the .05 level of significance. The means for pay grade E3 fell within the shaded, average scale-gradation block of the rating form. The means for pay grades E4 through E6 fell in the bottom half of the "Superior to Most" gradation block immediately above the average gradation block of the rating form.

Table 19 gives a comparison of the means and standard deviations of the rating scores, by pay grade, for the raters and indorsers on Advancement Potential (EER). Again, the means increase and the standard deviations decrease with increase in pay grade. The mean scores for the indorsers were lower for each pay grade. For the E3 and E4 pay grades, there is no significant difference between the raters and indorsers; for the E5 pay grade, there is difference at the .05 significance level; and at the E6 pay grade, there is difference at the .01 significance level. The means for pay grade E3 fell within the shaded, average scale gradation block of the rating form. The means for pay grades E4 through E6 fell in the bottom half of the "Promote Ahead of Peers" gradation block immediately above the average gradation block of the rating form.

TABLE 1:
COMPARISON OF VARIANCES FOR DUTY PERFORMANCE
TRAITS ON THE FIELD TRAIL FER (RATERS ONLY)

PAY GRADE	DUTY PERFORMANCE TRAITS									N
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
E3	1.39	1.64	.9	1.88	1.69	1.66	1.30	1.09	1.82	1.77
E4	1.00	1.25	1.30	1	1.23	1.25	1.12	1.54	1.44	1.21
E5	1.10	1.04	1.12	1	1	1.24	1.06	1.07	1.05	1.23
E6	.90	.86	.98	1.32	1.20	.98	.88	1.19	.93	1.14
										849

TABLE 18

SCORES ON DEMONSTRATED "OVERALL PERFORMANCE (EER)"

		N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	t RATIO
E3	Rater	101	28.99	11.04	.71
	Indorser	101	27.90	10.74	
E4	Rater	488	34.15	8.96	.59
	Indorser	475	32.81	8.65	
E5	Rater	1021	35.86	8.18	2.09 *
	Indorser	996	35.09	8.29	
E6	Rater	849	37.77	6.94	2.31 *
	Indorser	825	36.94	7.59	

* .05 significance level

TABLE 19
SCORES ON ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL (EER)

		N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	t RATIO
E3	Rater	101	19.75	7.69	.48
	Indorser	101	19.23	7.68	
E4	Rater	488	23.18	6.37	.76
	Indorser	475	22.87	6.22	
E5	Rater	1021	24.32	5.83	2.49 *
	Indorser	996	23.67	5.81	
E6	Rater	849	25.58	5.03	2.58**
	Indorser	825	24.93	5.21	

* significant at .05 level
 ** significant at .01 level

Tables 20 through 23 give data on how the SEER performed on the seven Performance Qualities, the seven Leadership Skills, Mission Accomplishment, and Advancement Potential.

Table 20 gives a comparison of variances for the seven Performance Qualities on the field trial SEER. An examination of the data in Table 20 reveals that, in general, the variances decrease as ratings progress from E6 through E9 pay grades. The variances across Performance Qualities within single pay grades are consistent and rather close for pay grades E6 and E7. For pay grades E8 and E9 there is a greater range of variances across the seven Performance Qualities. These lower variances indicate that for E8 and E9's either the ratings are doing a poorer job of differentiating job-performance behavior or there is less variation in performance at these two pay-grade levels.

Table 21 gives a comparison of the variances for the Leadership Skills on the field trial SEER. The results are very similar to those given in Table 20 for the seven Performance Qualities. Less differentiation in certain Leadership Skills is evident at the E8 and E9 pay grades than for the E6 and E7 pay grades.

Table 22 shows the means and standard deviations for the raters and indorsers by pay grades, for Mission Accomplishment (SEER). There is an increase in means and a decrease in standard deviations going from E6 to E8. There is little difference between E8 and E9 in these two statistics. There is no statistically significant difference between raters and indorsers at any pay grade. Each pay grade shows negative skewness of rating scores. All of the mean scores were in the "Superior to Most" rating scale gradation immediately above the shaded, average scale block of the rating form.

Table 23 shows the means and standard deviations for the raters and indorsers, by pay grade, for Advancement Potential (SEER). There is an increase in means and a decrease in standard deviations going from E6 to E9. There is a statistically significant difference (.05 significance level) between raters and indorsers at the E7 pay grade. The other pay grades show no statistically significant difference between the ratings for the two groups. Each pay grade shows negative skewness of rating scores. All of the mean scores were in the "Promote Ahead of Peers" rating scale gradation immediately above the shaded, average scale block of the rating form.

Table 24 shows a summary of the statistical differences between the rater and indorser ratings on the EER. These data indicate that the raters and indorsers did not differ significantly when rating the E3 and E4 soldiers but they did differ significantly when rating the E5 soldiers and were close to the .05 level for E6 soldiers. The .01 significance level for the overall EER score covering all pay grades is due to the bulk of the ratings for the E5 and E6 soldiers and the large number of soldiers (N) in the total sample.

TABLE 20
 COMPARISON OF VARIANCES FOR PERFORMANCE
 QUALITIES ON THE FIELD TRIAL SEER (RATERS ONLY)

PAY GRADE	PERFORMANCE QUALITIES*							N
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
E6	.69	.71	.79	.67	.59	.71	.53	145
E7	.53	.55	.61	.52	.52	.53	.35	386
E8	.44	.42	.64	.44	.24	.42	.21	132
E9	.36	.69	.71	.40	.14	.61	.11	51

* Quality 1 = Judgment

- 2 = Initiative
- 3 = Endurance
- 4 = Appearance
- 5 = Personal Conduct
- 6 = Responsibility
- 7 = Integrity

TABLE 21
COMPARISON OF VARIANCES FOR LEADERSHIP
SKILLS ON THE FIELD TRIAL SEER (RATERS ONLY)

PAY GRADE	LEADERSHIP SKILL*						N
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
E6	.66	.77	.74	.71	.79	.74	.77
E7	.67	.67	.61	.55	.48	.45	.55
E8	.50	.45	.46	.34	.37	.42	.41
E9	.45	.31	.53	.52	.44	.41	.53
						.51	

- * Skill 1 = Communications
- 2 = Counseling
- 3 = Training
- 4 = Relations with subordinates
- 5 = Peer relations
- 6 = Relations with superiors
- 7 = Decision ability

TABLE 2
SCORF: ON MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT - SEER

		N	MEAN	ST. N. & R. DEVIATION	t RATIO
E6	Rater	145	21.048	5.2709	.01
	Indorser	140	21.043	5.2586	
E7	Rater	386	23.155	4.8093	1.62
	Indorser	360	22.589	4.7145	
E8	Rater	132	24.773	4.1546	1.12
	Indorser	126	24.175	4.3819	
E9	Rater	51	24.667	4.2079	.14
	Indorser	46	24.545	4.3211	

TABLE 23
SCORES ON ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL - SEER

		N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	t RATIO
E6	Rater	145	19.621	6.2640	.27
	Indorser	140	19.421	6.0288	
E7	Rater	386	21.736	5.6226	1.99*
	Indorser	380	20.931	5.3956	
E8	Rater	132	22.750	5.1960	.96
	Indorser	126	22.111	5.4907	
E9	Rater	51	23.216	4.6960	.08
	Indorser	44	23.136	4.7963	

* Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 24
 SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN RATER AND INDORSER RATINGS ON THE EER

<u>TYPE OF SCORE</u>	<u>STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE (.05 or .01)</u>
Overall EER	
E3	No
E4	No
E5	.05
E6	No (Near .05)
Total	.01
Each of 10 "Job Performance Traits" by pay grade	none
Demonstrated Overall Performance	
E3	No
E4	No
E5	.05
E6	.05
Advancement Potential	
E3	No
E4	No
E5	.05
E6	.01

Table 25 shows a summary of the statistical differences between the rater and indorser ratings on the SEER. These data indicate that the raters and indorsers differed significantly in their ratings only at the E-7 pay grade for "Advancement Potential." All other rating comparisons lacked statistical significance.

Table 26 gives the intercorrelation ranges for each Job Performance Trait (on the field trial EER) with the other traits. These data indicate that considerable intercorrelation exists among the various traits. Because of computer programming problems no data were available to show the intercorrelation of the three major rating areas (i.e., (1) Job Performance Traits, (2) Demonstrated Overall Performance in Present Duty Position, and (3) Advancement Potential) on the EER.

Tables 27 through 29 present the intercorrelations of the four major rating components of the SEER (i.e., Performance Qualities, Leadership Skills, Mission Accomplishment, and Advancement Potential). The correlation indices run from .75 to .91 which indicate a high degree of intercorrelation. Thus, a strong, positive relationship was found to exist among all of these components.

The field trial SEER form (Appendix C (1)) included a block for the rater and indorser to rank order the three best Leadership Skills for the soldier being rated. Table 30 shows how the raters and indorsers rank ordered the three best Leadership Skills when completing the field trial SEER forms. The rankings are shown by pay grade and for totals of all ratings. For the E6s, the raters rank communications, training, and relations with subordinates as the top three skills possessed by the rated soldiers. For the E7s, the raters rank decision ability, training, and communications as the top three skills. For the E8s and E9s, decision ability, communications, and counseling are ranked as the top three skills. Across all pay grades, communications, decision ability, and training were ranked as the top three skills.

Rater and indorser rating scores for the SEER block titled, "Perf of Pers Supervised" (Part II, Block B) were tabulated by MOS codes. No attempt was made to cumulate these ratings for individual raters or for the total ratings. A review of the summaries by MOS code indicates a reluctance for raters or indorsers to use the "Declining" rating scale gradation. The "Stable" scale gradation was used most; however, the "Improving" scale gradation drew almost as many ratings. A considerable number of raters and indorsers chose not to rate this particular item. This agrees with the reluctance to use this type of item as expressed in the questionnaire and general comment returns.

Of the total number ($N = 3290$) of EER and SEER forms completed, only one "No" response was checked in the "Soldier Fulfills Responsibilities Concerning the Army's Equal Opportunity Program" block.

TABLE 25

**SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN RATER AND INDORSER RATINGS ON THE SEER**

<u>TYPE OF SCORE</u>	<u>STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE (.05 or .01)</u>
Overall SEFR	
E6	No
E7	No
E8	No
E9	No
Total	No
Each of 7 "Performance Qualities" by pay grade	None
Each of 7 "Leadership Skills" by pay grade	None
"Mission Accomplishment" by pay grade	None
"Advancement Potential"	
E6	No
E7	Yes
E8	No
E9	No

TABLE 26
INTERCORRELATIONS OF JOB PERFORMANCE TRAITS
(EER)

TRAIT NUMBER	RANGE OF INTERCORRELATIONS WITH OTHER TRAITS
1	.64 to .79
2	.66 to .84
3	.68 to .88
4	.66 to .88
5	.69 to .81
6	.68 to .84
7	.67 to .78
8	.67 to .79
9	.66 to .75
10	.64 to .73

TABLE 27
INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN MAJOR AREAS ON SEER
RATER

	Performance Qualities	Leadership Skills	Mission Accomplishment	Advancement Potential
Performance Qualities		.91	.79	.75
Leadership Skills			.80	.75
Mission Accomplishment				.87
Advancement Potential				

TABLE 28
INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN MAJOR AREAS ON SEER
INDORSER

	Performance Qualities	Leadership Skills	Mission Accomplishment	Advancement Potential
Performance Qualities		.88	.80	.76
Leadership Skills			.80	.75
Mission Accomplishment				.89
Advancement Potential				

TABLE 29
INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN MAJOR AREAS ON SEER
COMBINED

	Performance Qualities	Leadership Skills	Mission Accomplishment	Advancement Potential
Performance Qualities		.90	.81	.77
Leadership Skills			.81	.76
Mission Accomplishment				.89
Advancement Potential				

TABLE 30
RANK ORDER OF THREE BEST LEADERSHIP SKILLS
ON THE SEER

		LEADERSHIP SKILLS				RELATIONS WITH SUPERIORS		DECISION ABILITY	
		COMMUNICATIONS	COUNSELING	TRAINING	RELATIONC WITH SUBORDINATES	PEER RELATIONS	RELATIONS WITH SUPERIORS	DECISION ABILITY	
PAY GRADE									
E6	Rater	1	6.5	2	3	6.5	5	4	
	Indorser	1	7	3	2	6	5	4	
E7	Rater	3	5	2	4	7	6	1	
	Indorser	3	5	1	6	7	4	2	
E8	Rater	2	3	6	5	7	4	1	
	Indorser	2	6.5	4	3	6.5	5	1	
E9	Rater	1.5	3	6	4	7	5	1.5	
	Indorser	2	3.5	5.5	5.5	7	3.5	1	
		Rater	1	5	3	4	7	6	2
		Total	2	6	3	4	7	5	1

DISCUSSION

Nearly all the data reflected the need to keep the rating forms and the administrative procedures as simple as possible. This caused the forms to go from the multiple-copy, carbon-inserted, field-trial format back to a one-page format. Some reviewers of the revised one-page format still believed that the form was "too busy". However, to obtain such improvements as better defined and more objective trait descriptions, an open scoring system, more discriminating rating scales, addition of an indorser, and a provision for mandatory comments when scores are over or under certain limits, the forms had to be expanded. Naturally, this expansion, as compared with the present Enlisted Efficiency Report Form, will be considered by many soldiers as being "busier." On the other hand, a large percentage of the experimental users and reviewers believed that both of the new forms are a definite improvement over the old form.

Inflation of ratings is a perennial problem in the performance rating of enlisted soldiers. A large number of the individuals who were engaged in the field trial and those who reviewed the forms and collected data believed that the new rating procedures will not eliminate inflation. There was a general belief, however, that inflation would be curbed to a degree but that the true adjustment will be evident only after the new forms have been in operational use for a reasonable period of time (i.e., for at least six months). Inflation is an attitude or "mental set" condition inherent to the performance rating conditions and procedures. No evidence or data were revealed by this study that would provide a complete solution for this problem.

Comments received, and the summarized scoring data, gave some indication of overlapping of major rating areas as well as overlapping of traits within major rating areas where multiple traits or skills were concerned. When multiple traits or skills exist in a major rating area, efforts were made to make the traits or skills as independent as possible. A factor analysis study done under normal operational conditions very likely would reflect the variables and conditions which are functioning when the ratings are done for "pay." Even then, the findings will need to be tempered because of the inflationary conditions which are likely to continue.

Suggestions were made during the field trial that the various traits or skills being rated were not equally important and should be differentially weighted. Data were gathered from enlisted soldiers and used to assign weights (i.e., percent of total 125 score points) to the major rating areas (i.e., on the EER: (1) Duty Performance Traits, (2) Demonstrated Overall Performance of Assigned Duties, and (3) Advancement Potential; on the SEER: (1) Performance Qualities, (2) Leadership Skills, (3) Demonstrated Overall Performance, and (4) Advancement Potential). The empirical evidence available from the analysis of the rating scores did not reveal any large differences in variance among the major rating areas or among the separate traits within the multiple-trait rating areas. Even if there had been any significant differences, it

would have been impractical to use them to establish differential weights. Importance of traits or skills vary from one MOS to another. Thus, a different weighting scheme would need to be established for every MOS or at least common-core groups of MOS. The goal was to develop rating forms that would be applicable to any MOS. The administration manuals provided for the field trial were detailed and complete enough to suffice without reference to Chapter 8 of AR 600-200. These manuals contained completed sample portions of the forms. Many comments were received concerning the thoroughness of the instructions and the appreciation for sample entries on the form. On the other hand, comments were received that the manuals were too voluminous and gave much more information than was needed. In some instances, the raters stated that they did not take the time to read the instructions and went directly to completing the forms - apparently not wanting to read the voluminous manual. Analysis of these reactions resulted in a decision to have the EER and SEER administration pamphlet contain only the basic guidelines needed to complete the forms - a single pamphlet would be developed for both forms and would contain primarily the instruction and information not subject to frequent changes. The more changeable material would be retained in Chapter 8 of AR 600-200. This publication is under file or location control while the more concise pamphlets would be distributed freely to users of the two forms and thus would be more difficult to replace when changes are required.

An indorser was added to the rating scheme to give the rated soldier greater assurance that he was getting a "fair rating" and to have an additional observation enter into the rating score. The role of the reviewer in the rating scheme prior to 1 October 1975 did not serve this function. A comparison of the rater and indorser scores indicates that on the EER the raters nearly always had higher mean scores. A statistically significant difference occurred between rater and indorser scores for the E5 and E6 pay grades. However, this very likely was affected by the much larger number of cases (N) for the E5 and E6 soldiers. This difference may be caused by the raters giving the rated soldiers more of the "benefit of the doubt" (errors of leniency) since they must counsel the soldiers on their ratings. Regardless of cause, the lower indorser scores can help to temper inflation of ratings.

On the SEER, the higher scores were about equally divided for the raters and indorsers on the various parts of the form and the total score. The only statistically significant difference in rating was for pay grade E7 on Advance-ment Potential. Again, this pay grade had a substantially larger number (N) of rated soldiers. There appears to be more agreement between raters and indorsers on the SEER than on the EER. One conjectural reason for this occurrence is that at the higher pay grades the indorsers may be less able to observe the rated soldiers and, therefore, are more inclined to parrot the rater's rating.

The field trial was designed to determine if the E6 soldiers should be rated on the EER or on the SEER. Approximately 150 soldiers were rated on both forms. Preference for one form or the other was given by the rated soldiers as well as by the raters and endorsers. Overall, a nearly even split was given for preference to have the E6s rated on one or the other of the two forms. Other considerations such as Army-wide promotion procedures, the basic leadership duties engaged in by E6s, and the lower rating of E6s on the SEER than on the EER, were used to make the decision to have E6s rated on the SEER. Another indicator obtained from the feedback comments was that the SEER is still not the best rating form to use for Command Sergeant Majors (CSM). Development of such a form should be given consideration by the organization which works on the next generation of Enlisted Evaluation Report forms.

As described in the results section of this study, many sources were used to determine what traits, qualities, and skills were most appropriate to use on enlisted evaluation rating forms designed to be applicable across all MOS. The basic, narrative definition of the traits, qualities, and skills which went into the primary field trial forms was provided mainly by the research psychologists doing the study. Some assistance was obtained from a sample of soldiers at the US Army Institute of Administration (USAIA) in selecting from alternate definitions of the traits, qualities, and skills. However, when the field trial data were analyzed, there were still many suggestions made concerning changes to the type of traits, qualities, and skills as well as the wording. Some of these suggestions appeared to be mainly semantic in nature. There appeared to be some reluctance, however, at this stage of the development to want to make changes to the field trial forms. A caution for future developers of enlisted evaluation forms would be to have more complete and thorough study of traits and their definitions done before the primary field trial forms are designed.

REVISION

After analyzing all the field trial data, two revised forms were developed reflecting changes which were thought to be practical and essential. These forms were then reviewed by an ES selection board at ERC, by the Army Administration Center, as well as various groups who were briefed in connection with the approval process. The forms also were briefed to the SGM of the Army and at a SGM conference in Washington.

In December 1974, a briefing was given to the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER) on the recommended final rating forms and their respective instruction pamphlets.

IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW FORMS

The date of 1 October 1975 was established as the implementation time for the new forms. Army Pamphlet 623-1 (Preparation of Enlisted Evaluation Reports) was developed and Chapter 8, Evaluation Reports, of Army Regulation 600-200, Enlisted Personnel Management System, was revised to conform with the new forms.

As a part of the implementation of the new forms, the organization responsible for developing future generations of the enlisted rating form(s) should establish a systematic data collection and evaluation followup plan which will provide pertinent information for improving the next generation of the form(s).

APPENDIX A

ENLISTED EFFICIENCY REPORT (AR 600-200 and AR 135-205)										PO INITIAL																																																																																						
PART I PERSONAL DATA (To Be Completed By Personnel Officer)																																																																																																
A. NAME, RANK, ORGANIZATION and STATION			C. PMOSC		G. PAY GRADE			J. 4 SSAN																																																																																								
			D. SMOSC		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9			1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9																																																																																								
			E. DMOSC		H. DOES EM HAVE OVER 3 YEARS' SERVICE?			YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																								
B. DUTY POSITION TITLE			F. DATE OF RANK		I. TYPE OF REPORT			REG SPEC CCR PCS OTHER																																																																																								
K. BEGINNING MONTH PERIOD OF REPORT			BEGINNING YEAR					ENDING MONTH			ENDING YEAR																																																																																					
			70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79					70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79																																																																																								
PART II RATER (To Be Completed By Rater)																																																																																																
A. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES OR RESPONSIBILITIES NOT INDICATED BY DUTY MOS, IF ANY.																																																																																																
B. CHARACTERISTICS																																																																																																
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1. ADAPTABILITY</td> <td>0</td> <td>E</td> <td>AA</td> <td>A</td> <td>BA</td> <td>U</td> <td>RV</td> <td colspan="4">C. ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL IF I HAD THE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO DO SO I WOULD:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td colspan="4"> PROMOTE EM IMMEDIATELY PROMOTE EM AHEAD OF CONTemporaries PROMOTE EM WITH CONTemporaries NOT PROMOTE EM CONTINUE ACTIVE DUTY </td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. ATTITUDE</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td colspan="4"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. INITIATIVE</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td colspan="4"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. LEADERSHIP</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td colspan="4"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. RESPONSIBILITY</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td colspan="4"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. DUTY PERFORMANCE</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td colspan="4"></td> </tr> </table>												1. ADAPTABILITY	0	E	AA	A	BA	U	RV	C. ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL IF I HAD THE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO DO SO I WOULD:					1	0	1	0	0	0		PROMOTE EM IMMEDIATELY PROMOTE EM AHEAD OF CONTemporaries PROMOTE EM WITH CONTemporaries NOT PROMOTE EM CONTINUE ACTIVE DUTY				2. ATTITUDE	0	0	0	0	0	0						3. INITIATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0						4. LEADERSHIP	0	0	0	0	0	0						5. RESPONSIBILITY	0	0	0	0	0	0						6. DUTY PERFORMANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1. ADAPTABILITY	0	E	AA	A	BA	U	RV	C. ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL IF I HAD THE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO DO SO I WOULD:																																																																																								
	1	0	1	0	0	0		PROMOTE EM IMMEDIATELY PROMOTE EM AHEAD OF CONTemporaries PROMOTE EM WITH CONTemporaries NOT PROMOTE EM CONTINUE ACTIVE DUTY																																																																																								
2. ATTITUDE	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																										
3. INITIATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																										
4. LEADERSHIP	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																										
5. RESPONSIBILITY	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																										
6. DUTY PERFORMANCE	0	0	0	0	0	0																																																																																										
D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CAREER DEVELOPMENT (Not Counted In Score)																																																																																																
CONTINUE IN CURRENT DUTY MOS AT PRESENT ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL						YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	1 ADVANCED MOS-ORIENTED SCHOOLING (IF YES, SPECIFY MOS <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>)				YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																			
ASSIGNMENT IN CURRENT DUTY MOS AT HIGHER ORGANIZATION LEVEL						YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	5 DA NCO DEVELOPMENT COURSE				YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																			
3 ASSIGNMENT IN DIFFERENT DUTY MOS (IF YES, SPECIFY MOS <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>)						YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	6 SELECTION FOR CIVILIAN SCHO. ING.				YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>																																																																																			
E. COMMENTS OF RATER (Brief Specific Comments, Limit To Space Provided)																																																																																																
SAMPLE																																																																																																
F. RATER'S ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT						G. NAME AND RANK																																																																																										
						H. RATER'S SIGNATURE						I. DATE																																																																																				
PART III REVIEWER (To Be Completed By Reviewer)																																																																																																
A. THIS REPORT WAS PREPARED BY CORRECT RATER. I CONCUR WITH RATER <input type="checkbox"/> I DO NOT CONCUR WITH RATER <input type="checkbox"/> FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:																																																																																																
B. REVIEWER'S ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT						C. NAME AND RANK																																																																																										
						D. REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE						E. DATE																																																																																				

APPENDIX B (1)

ENLISTED EVALUATION REPORT AR 600-2001

PART I PERSONAL DATA

A NAME _____			B GRADE _____	
LAST	FIRST	MI		
D DATE OF RANK	E PMOSC	F SMOSC	G DMOSC	H DUTY POSITION TITLE AND AUTH PAY GRADE
I ORGANIZATION _____ STATION _____			J TYPE OF REPORT INIT ANNUAL CR SPEC OTHER	
L BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES NOT NORMALLY IDENTIFIED WITH POSITION TITLE			M PERIOD OF REPORT	
			BEGIN MO _____ YR _____	END MO _____ YR _____
			TCO NO	MPO UIC RPT SEQ NO.
K ENDING DATE LAST EER				
SAMPLE				

PART II RATINGS

A JOB PERFORMANCE TRAITS	RANKS WITH VERY BEST		SUPERIOR TO MOST		JOB NEEDS		NEEDS IMPROVEMENT		SCORE	B DEMONSTRATED OVERALL PERFORMANCE IN PRESENT DUTY POSITION				
	Exceeds	Meets	3	2	1	0	Some	Much		R I	Ranks With Very Best	Superior to Most	Exceeds or Meets Job Requirements	Demonstrates Shortcomings
1. IS WELL INFORMED ON ALL PHASES OF THE WORK? (Scope of knowledge about job)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 44 43	42 38 34	33 27 21 15	14 10 8	8 3 1
2. CARRIES OUT ORDERS THOROUGHLY WITHOUT CONSTANT SUPERVISION? (Dependability in performing without supervision)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
3. SHOWS INTEREST AND ENTHUSIASM FOR JOB? (Energy devoted to job mastery)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
4. DEVOTES FULL TIME AND ATTENTION TO THE JOB AND TO IMPROVEMENT OF THE WORK OF THE GROUP? (Willingness to work)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
5. SEEKS OUT OPPORTUNITIES TO BETTER SELF? (Effort directed toward realization of potential)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
6. DISPLAYS ABILITY TO INITIATE ACTION WITHOUT DIRECTION FROM OTHERS? (Aggressive pursuit of methods to improve job performance)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
7. IS SUCCESSFUL IN WORKING WITH OTHERS? (Ability to work in harmony with others)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
8. PERSONAL BEHAVIOR SETS A GOOD EXAMPLE FOR OTHERS? (Management of personal affairs and behavior)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
9. TAKES PRIDE IN NEATNESS OF DRESS AND APPEARANCE? (Neat and military in bearing)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
10. ACTIVELY WORKS AT MAINTAINING GOOD PHYSICAL CONDITION? (As required by present duty position)	R	I	5	4	3	2	1	0	R I	R 31	28 28 24	22 18 14 10	7 5 3	0
C ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL IF I HAD THE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO DO SO I WOULD (DISREGARD TIME IN GRADE REQUIREMENTS)														
Promote Immediately	Promote Ahead of Peers	Promote With Peers	Not Promote	Deny Continued Active Duty										
R 31	R 31	R 31	R 31	R 31										
D INDORSER HAS NOT OBSERVED AND CANNOT RATE SOLDIER														
E SCORE														
BLKS	RATER	INDORSER	F REPORT BASED ON											
A			Daily Contact	R I										
B			Freq Obsv											
C			Infreq Obsv											
SUM			Reports & Records											
			RPT SCORE											
G SOLDIER FULFILLS RESPONSIBILITIES CONCERNING THE ARMY'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM														
YES		NO												
R I		I I												
MPO AUTHENTICATION														
A REPORT ENTERED ON SOLDIER'S DA FORM 2			B COPY OF THIS REPORT MAILED TO SOLDIER ON _____ (date)			C MPO SIGNATURE AND DATE								
DATE			BY CERT MAIL NO.											

APPENDIX B (2)

RATED SOLDIER'S LAST NAME AND SSN																
PART II CONTINUED																
H CAREER DEVELOPMENT																
POTENTIAL TO SERVE IN 1SG DUTY POSITION (E6 ONLY)																
<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td>Outstanding</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Excellent</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Good</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Fair</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>None</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>		Outstanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outstanding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
I COMMENTS ON JOB PERFORMANCE TRAITS (BLOCK A) — MANDATORY IF SCORE IS BELOW 10 OR OVER 40																
RATER	INDORSER															
J COMMENTS ON DEMONSTRATED OVERALL PERFORMANCE (BLOCK B) — MANDATORY IF SCORE IS BELOW 6 OR OVER 42																
RATER	INDORSER															
K COMMENTS ON ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL (BLOCK C) — MANDATORY IF SCORE IS BELOW 10 OR OVER 22																
RATER	INDORSER															
L EXPLANATION OF EXCEPTIONAL CONTRIBUTION OR "NO" RESPONSE TO ARMY'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM (BLOCK G)																
RATER	INDORSER															
PART III RATER AUTHENTICATION																
A ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	B NAME AND GRADE	C DATE														
	D SIGNATURE															
PART IV INDORSER AUTHENTICATION																
A ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	B NAME AND GRADE	C DATE														
	D SIGNATURE															
PART V REVIEWER AUTHENTICATION																
A SOLDIER WAS RATED BY CORRECT RATER AND INDORSER. I CONCUR WITH BOTH <input type="checkbox"/> I DO NOT CONCUR WITH RATER <input type="checkbox"/> INDORSER <input type="checkbox"/> FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS.																
B ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	C NAME AND GRADE	D DATE														
	E SIGNATURE															
PART VI RATED SOLDIER AUTHENTICATION																
A I HAVE RECEIVED A COPY OF THIS REPORT	B SIGNATURE	C DATE														

Best Available Copy

APPENDIX C (2)

RATED SOLDIER'S LAST NAME AND SSN		
PART II CONTINUED		
L CAREER DEVELOPMENT		
SELECT FOR COMMAND SERGEANT MAJOR <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES SELECT FOR FIRST SERGEANT <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
M COMMENTS ON PERFORMANCE QUALITIES (BLOCK A) — MANDATORY IF SCORE IS BELOW 11 OR OVER 32 RATER INDORSER		
N COMMENTS ON LEADERSHIP SKILLS (BLOCK C) — MANDATORY IF SCORE IS BELOW 11 OR OVER 32 RATER INDORSER		
O COMMENTS ON MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT (BLOCK D) — MANDATORY IF SCORE IS BELOW 4 OR OVER 16 RATER INDORSER		
P COMMENTS ON ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL (BLOCK E) — MANDATORY IF SCORE IS BELOW 6 OR OVER 14 RATER INDORSER		
Q EXPLANATION OF EXCEPTIONAL CONTRIBUTION OR "NO" RESPONSE TO ARMY'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM (BLOCK I) RATER INDORSER		
PART III RATER AUTHENTICATION		
A ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	B NAME AND GRADE	C DATE
	D SIGNATURE	
PART IV INDORSER AUTHENTICATION		
A ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	B NAME AND GRADE	C DATE
	D SIGNATURE	
PART V REVIEWER AUTHENTICATION		
A SOLDIER WAS RATED BY CORRECT RATER AND INDORSER <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I CONCUR WITH BOTH <input type="checkbox"/> I DO NOT CONCUR WITH RATER <input type="checkbox"/> INDORSER <input type="checkbox"/> FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS		
B ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	C NAME AND GRADE	D DATE
	E SIGNATURE	
PART VI RATED SOLDIER AUTHENTICATION		
A I HAVE RECEIVED A COPY OF THIS REPORT	B SIGNATURE	C DATE

APPENDIX D

ENLISTED EVALUATION REPORT (AR 600-206)

For preparation, see DA Pamphlet 623-1

C

SSN

PART I PERSONAL DATA

A. GRADE (ABBR) NAME (LAST) (FIRST) (MI) SSN B. TYPE OF REPORT

MAJ	AS	CR	SP
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<input type="checkbox"/>									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<input type="checkbox"/>									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<input type="checkbox"/>									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<input type="checkbox"/>									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<input type="checkbox"/>									

D. ORGANIZATION AND STATION

OTHER

SPECIFY

E. PMOSC F. DMOSC G. SMOSC

H. PERIOD OF REPORT

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

BEGIN

VR 4 75 46 1 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

END

VR 1 75 18 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29

S

O

N

D

F

C

V

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

C

<div data-bbox="628 164

DA Form 2166-5 1 Jul 75

This form, together with DA Form 2166-5A, 1 Jul 25, replaces DA Form 2166-4, 1 Jul 25, which is obsolete.

RATED SOLDIER'S LAST NAME AND SSN

PART II CONTINUED

I. CAREER DEVELOPMENT (RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOLING AND ASSIGNMENTS)

J. 1. COMMENTS ARE MANDATORY TO JUSTIFY RATINGS IN PART II AS FOLLOWS:

a. BLOCK E SCORE BELOW 10 OR OVER 40, BLOCK F SCORE BELOW 6 OR OVER 42, BLOCK G SCORE BELOW 10 OR OVER 22, OR BLOCK D IF SOLDIER DOES NOT SUPPORT ARMY'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.

b. INDORSER WHO CHECKS BLOCK II B

2. REMARKS OTHERWISE OPTIONAL.

RATER

SAMPLE

INDORSER

PART III RATER AUTHENTICATION

A. ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT

TION

GNMENT

B. NAME AND GRADE

C. DATE

D. SIGNATURE

PART IV INDORSER AUTHENTICATION

A. ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT

B. NAME AND GRADE

C. DATE

D. SIGNATURE

PART V SOLDIER AUTHENTICATION

A. I HAVE SEEN A COPY OF THIS REPORT COMPLETE THROUGH ACTION BY THE INDORSER I HAVE BEEN COUNSELED CONCERNING THE REPORT

B. NAME AND GRADE

C. DATE

D. SIGNATURE

PART VI REVIEWER AUTHENTICATION

A. SOLDIER WAS RATED BY CORRECT RATER AND INDORSER NO FURTHER ACTION REQUIRED. MY REVIEW RESULTS IN ACTION INDICATED BY INCLOSURES.

B. ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT

C. NAME AND GRADE

D. DATE

E. SIGNATURE

PART VII MILPO CERTIFICATION

A. DATE REPORT ENTERED ON DA FORM 2-1:

C.

D.

B. SOLDIER'S COPY GIVEN TO SOLDIER FORWARDED TO SOLDIER
MAILED TO SOLDIER CERTIFIED MAIL NO _____

MILPO SIGNATURE

E/C

APPENDIX E

SENIOR ENLISTED EVALUATION REPORT (AR 600-200)												C. SSN																						
For preparation, see DA Pamphlet 623-1.																																		
PART I PERSONAL DATA																																		
A. GRADE (abbr) NAME (LAST) (FIRST) (MID)				SSN		B. TYPE OF REPORT																												
						INIT	ANL	CR	SP																									
						OTHER		SPECIFY																										
D. ORGANIZATION AND STATION																																		
E. EMOSC			F. DMOSC		G. SMOSC		H. PERIOD OF REPORT			I. NONRATED PERIOD																								
							MO	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	S	O	N	D	MO	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	S	O	N	D				
							AN	U	E	M	A	M	J	J	U	S	O	N	DE	AN	U	E	M	A	M	J	J	U	S	O	N	DE		
							NE	R	U	V	U	N	U	N	U	G	P	T	V	C	NE	R	U	V	U	N	U	N	U	G	P	T	V	C
							BEGIN	YR											END	YR														
J. DUTY POSITION TITLE																																		
AUTH PAY GR																																		
PART II RATINGS																																		
A. PRIOR DESCRIPTION OF DUTIES																																		
SAMPLE																																		
B. INDORSEER HAS NOT OBSERVED AND CAN NOT RATE SOLDIER			C. REPORT BASED ON:		DAILY CONTACT		ERLO OBSN		INQUIR QBSN		REPT & REC		D. SOLDIER SUPPORTS THE ARMY'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM																					
			R		R		R		R		R		YES R																					
			I		I		I		I		I		NO I																					
E. PERFORMANCE QUALITIES			RANKS WITH VERY BEST		SUPERIOR TO MOST		EXCELEDS OR MILTS DUTY REQUIREMENTS		NEEDS IMPROVEMENT		SCORE		F. LEADERSHIP SKILLS			RANKS WITH VERY BEST		SUPERIOR TO MOST		EXCELEDS OR MILTS DUTY REQUIREMENTS		NEEDS IMPROVEMENT		SCORE										
			5		4		3		2		1 0 R I					5		4		3		2		1 0 R I										
1. Anticipates requirements and actively pursues methods of improving duty performance. (Initiative)			R		I		I		I		R I		1. Is clear and to the point in conveying information and in giving directions. (Communications)			R		I		I		I		R I										
2. Is physically fit, as required, for MOS/grade during combat. (Physical Condition)			R		I		I		I		R I		2. Promotes personal and professional growth of subordinates through personal interest in their problems. (Counseling)			R		I		I		I		R I										
3. Takes pride in high standards of dress, grooming, and military manner. (Military Bearing)			R		I		I		I		R I		3. Provides effective instruction (formal or informal) to improve the professional competence of subordinates. (Training)			R		I		I		I		R I										
4. Behavior on and off duty is in accordance with highest Army standards. (Personal Conduct)			R		I		I		I		R I		4. Seeks best course of action after evaluating the alternatives. (Decision Ability)			R		I		I		I		R I										
5. Is dependable and conscientious in fulfilling obligations. (Responsibility)			R		I		I		I		R I		5. Is fair, inspires confidence, accepts guidance, and has earned respect. (Relationships with Others)			R		I		I		I		R I										
6. Is well informed on the scope of knowledge required for assigned duties. (Technical Competence)			R		I		I		I		R I		TOTALS			R		I		I		I		R I										
G. DEMONSTRATED OVERALL PERFORMANCE			Ranks With Very Best		Superior to Most		Exceeds or Meets Duty Requirements		Demonstrates Shortcomings		SCORE		H. ADVANCED POTENTIAL - If I had the authority and responsibility to do so, I would (Disregard time in grade requirements)			Promote Immediately		Promote Ahead of Peers		Promote With Peers		Not Promote		Deny Continued Active Duty		SCORE								
																R 30 28		I 26 22 18		I 14 10 6		R 2		I 0										
RATER			40 38 36 33 30 27		23 20 17 14		10 8 6 3 1						I. BIK I BIK I BIK G BIK B SCORES			R		I		I		R		I		RPI SCORE								
INDORSER													SUM OF SCORES													2								

DA Form 2166-5A 1 Jul 75 This form, together with DA Form 2166-5, 1 Jul 75, replaces DA Form 2166-4, 1 Jul 70, which is obsolete. USAFPP 255-40 9/75

RAIDED SOLDIER'S LAST NAME AND SSN	
PART II CONTINUED	
J. CAREER DEVELOPMENT (RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOLING AND ASSIGNMENTS)	
RECOMMEND FOR:	
CSM (E-8 & E-9) ISG (E-7)	
R <input type="checkbox"/> R <input type="checkbox"/> I <input type="checkbox"/> I <input type="checkbox"/>	
K. 1. COMMENTS ARE MANDATORY TO JUSTIFY RATINGS IN PART II AS FOLLOWS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. BLOCK E SCORE BELOW 6 OR OVER 24, BLOCK F SCORE BELOW 5 OR OVER 20, BLOCK G SCORE BELOW 6 OR OVER 36, BLOCK H SCORE BELOW 6 OR OVER 14, OR BLOCK D IF SOLDIER DOES NOT SUPPORT ARMY'S EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM. b. ENDORSER WHO CHECKS BLOCK II B. 2. REMARKS OTHERWISE OPTIONAL. 	
RATER	
<i>SAMPLE</i>	
ENDORSER	
PART III RATER AUTHENTICATION	
A. ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	
B. NAME AND GRADE	
C. DATE	
D. SIGNATURE	
PART IV ENDORSER AUTHENTICATION	
A. ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	
B. NAME AND GRADE	
C. DATE	
D. SIGNATURE	
PART V SOLDIER AUTHENTICATION	
A. I HAVE BEEN A COPY OF THIS REPORT COMPLETE THROUGH ACTION BY THE ENDORSER. I HAVE BEEN COUNSELED CONCERNING THE REPORT.	
B. NAME AND GRADE	
C. DATE	
D. SIGNATURE	
PART VI REVIEWER AUTHENTICATION	
A. SOLDIER WAS RATED BY CORRECT RATER AND ENDORSER. NO FURTHER ACTION REQUIRED. <input type="checkbox"/>	
MY REVIEW RESULTS IN ACTION INDICATED BY INCLOSURES. <input type="checkbox"/>	
B. ORGANIZATION AND DUTY ASSIGNMENT	
C. NAME AND GRADE	
D. DATE	
E. SIGNATURE	
PART VII MILPO CERTIFICATION	
A. DATE REPORT ENTERED ON DA FORM 2-1:	
B. SOLDIER'S COPY GIVEN TO SOLDIER <input type="checkbox"/> FORWARDED TO SOLDIER <input type="checkbox"/> MAILED TO SOLDIER <input type="checkbox"/> CERTIFIED MAIL NO. _____	
C. MILPO SIGNATURE	
D. UIC	

APPENDIX F

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PAMPHLET

No. 523-1

PERSONNEL EVALUATION

**PREPARATION OF ENLISTED
EVALUATION REPORTS**

Effective 1 October 1975

HEADQUARTERS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

MAY 1975

PAMPHLET
No. 623-1

HEADQUARTERS
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON, DC, 7 May 1975

PERSONNEL EVALUATION PREPARATION OF ENLISTED EVALUATION REPORTS

1. Purpose. This pamphlet provides instructions for completing DA Forms 2166-5, Enlisted Evaluation Report (EUR), for personnel in pay grade E-5 and below and 2166-5A Senior Enlisted Evaluation Report (SEER), for personnel in pay grade E-6 and above.

2. Concept. The Army must maintain an efficient and effective system of personnel evaluation. The evaluation report is of major significance in achieving this objective.

Each evaluation report affects not only the soldier evaluated but also other soldiers and the Army as a whole. The report is important for the soldier's own career objectives, but it also impacts upon the personnel management system and upon the Army's ability to maintain an enlisted force of high quality.

In order to insure fairness in the rating of soldiers, no one facet of the individual's performance should be considered as the prime factor to be evaluated. No single instance of outstanding or mediocre performance should be allowed to overshadow the individual's total performance. Rather, the evaluation should weigh the entire spectrum of the soldier's performance during the rated period.

If evaluations are to be valid, it is necessary that they be based on the "whole person" concept. The evaluation must address all pertinent areas of performance, potential, and character. These include demonstrated performance of duty, personal conduct, physical fitness, appearance, attitude, and other factors.

An evaluation report which is rendered carefully and fairly, along with performance on skill tests, gives a reliable indication of the soldier's competence in comparison with others of the same grade. Such evaluations enhance the credibility of the evaluation system, and allow for the careful screening of the enlisted ranks which is necessary to maintain high military professional standards.

3. Responsibilities. *a.* The Commanding Officer

of the soldier is responsible for designating the rater and indorser. The rater must be in the direct line of supervision over the rated soldier. The rater must be in pay grade E-6 or above and at least one pay grade higher than the rated soldier. The indorser also must be in the direct line of supervision and senior to the rater in either pay grade or date of rank. The reviewer must be a warrant or commissioned officer in direct line of supervision and senior to the indorser. If civilian supervisors are part of the rating scheme, refer to chapter 8, AR 600-200 for necessary guidelines.

b. The Military Personnel Officer is responsible for completing Part I of the Evaluation Report. The Evaluation Report is completed in turn by the rater, the indorser, and the reviewer. Except in cases where the rated soldier has departed for a permanent change of station, the indorser obtains the rated soldier's signature in Part V prior to forwarding the report to the reviewer. After the reviewer has authenticated the report, the completed Evaluation Report is returned to the Military Personnel Officer. The Military Personnel Officer reviews the report for accuracy, enters the period of the report on the soldier's record, and transmits a copy of the report to the rated soldier. If the report is adverse, the MILPO will provide written guidance on procedures for appeal to the rated soldier with the soldier's copy of the report.

4. General Instructions For Preparing Evaluation Reports. *a.* The Evaluation Report is machine-scored by means of mark sensing. In completing the mark sensed portion of the form:

1. Use a number 2 lead pencil
2. Erase completely any changes
3. Do not mark outside box
4. Mark all space within box
5. Make pencil marks heavy
6. Do not fold, tear or otherwise mutilate the form.

b. Part I and VII of the report will be completed by the Military Personnel Officer

*This pamphlet supersedes DA Pam 623-1, 1 October 1970.

(MILPO). Parts II, III, IV and V will be completed by the rater and indorser. Part VI will be completed by the reviewer except when the rater or indorser is a General Officer or officer of flag rank and no reviewer is required.

5. Instructions For Completing Part II of EER: Raters and Indorsers. (MILPO will have completed Part I.)

A. *Check Part I* carefully for possible discrepancies and proceed with Part II.

B. *Block A.*

The rater will enter actual duties performed by the rated soldier including additional duties.

C. *Block B.*

If the indorser cannot give an accurate and reliable rating to the individual, Block B should be checked and explained in Block J. In this case no other portions of Part II will be completed by the indorser.

D. *Block C.*

Two selections are possible. Check the appropriate box to indicate frequency of contact, and, if applicable, also check "reports and records."

E. *Block D.*

Mark the "yes" or "no" block as appropriate. A "no" response here requires explanation in Block J.

F. *Block E. Duty Performance Traits.*

Rate the individual carefully on each of the ten duty performance traits by marking the appropriate box for each trait. Mark ratings in soft pencil on the basis of the given rating scale. Enter the score for each trait in black ink in the score box at the right-hand column. Total these scores and enter in the totals box at the bottom of the right-hand column, and in the appropriate location in Block H. The same marking procedure will be used for Blocks F and G, using the appropriate boxes in Block H. If the score for Block E exceeds 40 or is less than 10, justify in Block J.

G. *Block F. Demonstrated Overall Performance of Assigned Duties.*

It is in this section that the rated soldier's strengths and weaknesses can be considered using the yardstick of overall performance. If score exceeds 42 or is below 6, justify in Block J.

H. *Block G. Advancement Potential.*

Rate the soldier on ability to perform in the next higher grade by considering the soldier's

total capacity in comparison with other individuals of the same grade and length of service. If score exceeds 22 or is below 10, justify in Block J.

I. *Block H. Scores.*

The rater and indorser enter the scores from the appropriate boxes from Blocks E, F, and G and total them. The indorser then adds the two subscores (sum of scores). The total score cannot exceed 250 points. Dividing this total by two, the indorser will enter the result as the report score. The result will be a whole number or a whole number and a decimal (e.g. 117, 117.5). If only a rater is involved, the rater's total will be entered as the report score.

J. *Block I. Career Development.*

Recommendations for logical career development, such as advanced schooling and special assignments are appropriate here.

K. *Block J. Comments.*

This block is provided for comments by the rater and indorser. Scores requiring mandatory comments are listed in the heading of this block. Comments may be made in this block regardless of scores. Comments must be either typed or neatly printed in black ink.

6. Instructions for Completing Part II of SEEER: Raters and Indorsers. (MILPO will have completed Part I.)

A. *Check Part I* carefully for possible discrepancies and proceed with Part II.

B. *Block A.*

The rater will enter actual duties performed by the rated soldier including additional duties.

C. *Block B.*

If the indorser cannot give an accurate and reliable rating for the individual, Block B should be checked and explained in Block K. In this case no other portions of Part II will be completed by the indorser.

D. *Block C.*

Two selections are possible. Check the appropriate box to indicate frequency of contact, and, if applicable, also check "reports and records".

E. *Block D.*

Mark the "yes" or "no" block as appropriate. A "no" response here requires explanation in Block K.

F. Block E. Performance Qualities.

Rate the individual carefully on each of the six performance qualities by marking the appropriate box for each quality. Mark ratings in soft pencil on the basis of the given rating scale. Enter the score for each quality in block ink in the score box at the right-hand column. Total these scores and enter in the totals box at the bottom of the right-hand column, and in the appropriate location in Block I. The same marking procedure will be used for Blocks F, G, and H, using the appropriate boxes in Block I. If the score for Block E exceeds 24 or is less than 6, justify in Block K.

G. Block F. Leadership Skills.

These skills are critical to the senior enlisted soldier. The soldier's performance as a leader depends on mastering them. If the score exceeds 20 or is below 5, justify in Block K.

H. Block G. Demonstrated Overall Performance.

A rating form can rarely cover all of the attributes and traits required for a complete evaluation. It is in this section that you can consider all of the rated soldier's strengths and weaknesses, using the yardstick of overall performance. If score exceeds 36 or is below 6, justify in Block K.

I. Block H. Advancement Potential.

Rate the soldier on ability to perform the next higher grade by considering total capacity in comparison with other individuals of the same grade and length of service. If score exceeds 14 or is below 6, justify in Block K.

J. Block I. Scores.

The rater and indorser enter the scores from the appropriate boxes from Blocks E, F, G, and H and total them. The indorser then adds the two sub-scores (sum of scores). This total score cannot exceed 250 points. Dividing this total by two the indorser enters the result as the report score. The result will be a whole number or a whole number and a decimal (e.g., 117, 117.5). If only a rater is involved the rater's total will be the report score.

K. Block J. Career Development.

Recommendation for logical career development, such as advanced schooling and special assignments are appropriate here. If the soldier has the potential to be a First Sergeant or Com-

mand Sergeant Major, check the appropriate block according to grade.

L. Block K. Comments.

This block is provided for comments by the rater and indorser. Scores requiring mandatory comment are listed in the headings of the block. Comments may be made in this block regardless of the score. Comments must be handwritten or typed or neatly printed.

7. Instructions For Completing Parts III, IV, V, VI, and VII of SFER and SFER.

1. Preparing Parts III and IV. (Raters and Indorser). The rater and indorser will complete Parts III and IV respectively. These entries, except for signature, must be typed or printed in black ink. Use black ink for signatures.

M. Counseling.

1. After signing the report, the rater will discuss the report with the rated soldier and counsel the soldier. After counseling, the rater will forward the report to the indorser.

2. To be truly effective, performance counseling must not be limited to this occasion, but should occur whenever guidance is appropriate. Performance counseling or "coaching" starts on the day the soldier reports for duty and continues through the soldier's entire assignment. Constructive counseling must be adapted to the varying circumstances or specific situations. It must be executed carefully and conscientiously. Counseling must be designed to enhance the effectiveness of subordinates in the performance of specific duties.

C. Obtaining Rated Soldier's Signature in Part I (Indorser).

1. The indorser is responsible for obtaining the rated soldier's signature in Part V, prior to forwarding the report to the reviewer. However, if the soldier has departed for a permanent change of station without seeing and signing the evaluation report, the indorser will note this fact in Part V, and forward the report to the reviewer without the rated soldier's signature.

2. Prior to obtaining the rated soldier's signature on the evaluation form, the indorser will verify that the rater has counseled the soldier regarding the Evaluation Report.

3. The indorser will further counsel the soldier.

4. If the report is adverse, the indorser will advise the soldier of the nature of the report and

inform the soldier that the MILPO will provide guidance for submission of appeals.

D. Preparing Part VI (Reviewer).

1. The designated reviewer will complete Blocks A, B, C, D, and E, using black ink or typing.

2. The reviewer is responsible for assuring that:

a. The top rater and indorser completed the form.

b. The required justification for low or high ratings has been made, addresses pertinent areas, and appears reasonable.

c. Any negative entry for the Equal Opportunity block is adequately documented.

E. Preparing Part VII (MILPO).

MILPO will complete Blocks A, B, C and D (six position alpha numeric unit identification code of MILPO will be entered in Block D).

3. General Instructions on Adverse and Special Reports (EER and SEER).

A. Adverse Reports.

1. Definition.

An Evaluation Report is adverse when:

a. The rating scores awarded in Part II, by either rater or indorser, are so low as to require written justification.

b. Part II, Block D, shows a negative entry for the Equal Opportunity Program.

2. Handling of Adverse Reports.

a. If a report is adverse, according to the above definition, the indorser will advise the rated soldier of the nature of the report and inform the soldier that MILPO will provide assistance for submission of appeal.

b. Upon receipt of an adverse report, the reviewer will:

(1) Inquire as to any unusual circumstances surrounding submission of the report.

(2) Refer the report to the rater and/or indorser for further comment or clarification as appropriate.

c. After authenticating an adverse report, the reviewer will forward to MILPO.

B. Special Report.

Special reports may be prepared when a soldier's performance of duty is, in the rater's opinion, so outstanding or deficient that it warrants submission of a report prior to the annual report. For fuller details, see AR 600-200.

9. Administrative Processing of Reports by the Military Personnel Officer (EER and SEER).

A. The Military Personnel Officer (MILPO) initiates the initial and annual Evaluation Report by completing Part I and entering the soldier's last name and social security number on the top line of Page 2. Change of rater Evaluation Reports (CR) will be initiated primarily by the raters; however, they may be initiated by the MILPO. A special Evaluation Report (SP) is always initiated by the rater. A report initiated by the rater will be coordinated with the MILPO for completion of Part I prior to completing subsequent parts of the form. When completing the non-rated period block of Part I, a rated month is defined as any month in which the rater supervised the soldier 16 or more calendar days. Otherwise the month will be counted as non-rated with the reason for non-rating recorded on the "Reason Codes" line in the appropriate cell as shown in table 1.

B. The MILPO will forward the forms through the commander to the rater. The form is completed in turn by the rater, indorser, and reviewer. The reviewer returns the completed Evaluation Report to the MILPO, who reviews the report for accuracy. The MILPO enters the date of the report on DA Form 2-1, reproduces the report and provides a copy to the rated soldier. The report is transmitted to the rated soldier as follows:

1. Reports which are not adverse and have been signed by the soldier, may be forwarded through the distribution center in a sealed envelope, given to the soldier, or sent by first-class mail.

2. Reports which are not adverse but have not been signed by the soldier, will be sent to the soldier by first-class mail.

3. Reports which are adverse and have been signed by the rated soldier may be given to the soldier personally or forwarded through the distribution center in a sealed envelope.

4. Adverse reports which must be mailed will, in all cases, be sent by certified mail.

C. The MILPO will send the original report to USAEEC. Detailed MILPO responsibilities are specified in chapter 8, AR 600-200.

Table 1. Codes for Non-Rated Periods

<i>Code</i>	<i>Definition</i>
A.....	AWOL/Desertion.
B.....	Break in active service (must be 12 months or less. If more than 12 months, begin date of the EER will be month soldier returned to active duty. Inclusive dates of break in service will be added to the non-rated period block on the EER/SEER.
C.....	Confinement in a military or civilian detention facility; assigned to Military Personnel Control Facility; or, assigned to Correctional Training Facility.
I.....	Intransit between duty stations including leave, travel and TDY.
M.....	Missing in Action.
P.....	Patient (includes convalescent leave).
Q.....	Lack of Rater Qualification (60 days for E-1 thru E-5) or (90 days for E-6 thru E-9).
R.....	Recruiter Intern.
S.....	Student at a military or civilian school.
T.....	TDY or Special Duty (SD) other than as a student. If TDY or SD will exceed 60 calendar days for E-5 and below or 90 calendar days for E-6 thru E-9 soldiers, then a Change of Rater report is required upon departure to the TDY or SD unit and by the TDY or SD unit upon return to parent unit.
W.....	Prisoner of War.
Z.....	None of the above. Letter of explanation attached.

The proponent agency of this pamphlet is the US Army Military Personnel Center. Users are invited to send comments and suggested improvements on DA Form 2028 (Recommended Changes to Publications and Blank Forms) direct to HQDA (DAPC-EPP-E) Alexandria, VA 22331.

By Order of the Secretary of the Army:

Official:

VERNE L. BOWERS
Major General, United States Army
The Adjutant General

FRED C. WEYAND
General, United States Army
Chief of Staff

DISTRIBUTION:

Active Army, ARNG, USAR: To be distributed in accordance with two (2) times DA Form 12-9A requirements for DA Pamphlets, Personnel Efficiency Ratings—A (Qty Rqr Block No. 426).

TAGO 421A

U S GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1975

REFERENCES/LITERATURE SOURCES

Bodi, M. J. Statement Scaling Study for 14 Rating Characteristics of the Commander's Evaluation Report. Indianapolis, Indiana; US Army Enlisted Evaluation Center; 1967 (Research Study No. 89, AD 664 770)

Department of the Army. Military Leadership. DA Field Manual 22-100; Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1973

Department of the Army. Army Regulation 600-200, Chapter 8.

Department of the Army. Army Regulation 623-105, Chapter 4.

Guilford, J. P., Fruchter, B. 5th ed. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973

Guilford, J. P. 2d ed. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954

Helme, W. H., Willemin, L. P., & Day, R. W. Psychological Factors Measured in the Differential Officer Battery. US Army Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, 1971 (Technical Research Report 1173)

Helme, W. H., Waters, L. K. & Anderson, A. A. Analysis of Job Performance Ratings Obtained in Reenlistment Study. US Army Personnel Research Office, OCRD, 1963 (Research Memorandum 63-3)

Jacobs, T. O. Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations. Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO), Alexandria, Virginia, 1975

Lodahl, T. M. & Kejner, M. The Definition and Measurement of Job Involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, Feb 1965, Vol 49, No. 1

Payne, S. L. The Art of Asking Questions. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951

Peters, D. L. & McCormick, E. J. Comparative Reliability of Numerically Anchored Versus Job-Task Anchored Rating Scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, Feb 1966, Vol 50, No. 1

Robertson, D. W. Source Documents for the Automated Enlisted Performance Evaluation System. Naval Personnel and Training Research Laboratory, San Diego, California 92152, March 1972 (Research Memorandum SRM 72-10)

Smith, P. C. & Kendall, L. M. Retranslation of Expectations: An Approach to the Construction of Unambiguous Anchors for Rating Scales. Journal of Applied Psychology Apr 1963, Vol 47, No. 2

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, Irving R., and Massarick, Fred Leadership and Motivation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961

Urry, V. W. & Nicewander, W. A. Factor Analysis of the Commander's Evaluation Report. Indianapolis, Indiana: US Army Enlisted Evaluation Center, 1966 (Research Study No. 40, AD 636 328)

Whisler, T. L., Harper, S. F. Performance Appraisal-Research and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962

Weissenberg, P. & Gruenfeld, L. W. Relationship Among Leadership Dimensions & Cognitive Style. Journal of Applied Psychology, Oct 1966, Vol 50, No. 5

Yellen, T. I., Corts, D. B., Burt, J. A. and Waldkoetter, R. O. Revision of the Enlisted Efficiency Report. Indianapolis, Indiana; US Army Enlisted Evaluation Center; 1970 (Technical Memorandum No. 31)

Distribution List

Technical Memorandum

US Army Enlisted Records and Evaluation Center

DCSPER	1	USAES	1
Dir, MILPERCEN	1	USAFAAS	1
PMSD, MILPERCEN	1	USAIS	1
EPMD, MILPERCEN	1	USAIA	1
ATTN: C&E Br		USAICs	1
TRADOC, ATTN: ITEG	6	USAMDVS	1
CDR, ADMINCEN, FBH, IN	1	USAMEOS	1
AIR, Washington, DC	1	USAMPS	1
ARI, Arlington, VA	1	USAMCS	1
HumRRO, Alex, VA	1	USAOC&S	1
Ft Knox, KY	1	USAQMS	1
Presidio of	1	USASATC&S	1
Monterey, CA		USASMA	1
Ft Bliss, TX	1	USASCS	1
Ft Benning, GA	1	USASES	1
Ft Rucker, AL	1	USATSC	1
AHSUSA	1	WRAIR	1
DINFOS	1	WHCA	1
SBO, TAGO	1	CO, Naval Ed & Trng	1
TJAGSA	1	Development Center,	
Chief of Chaplains	1	Pensacola, FL	
The Judge Advocate General	1	CO, AFHRL, Lackland	1
The Surgeon General	1	AFB, TX	
US Army Security Agency	1	USNPRA, San Diego, CA	1
USAADS	1	COMDT, Marine Corps	1
USAARMS	1	(Code AX) ATTN: R&D	
USAAVNS	1	US Coast Guard Institute	1
USACHCS	1	Oklahoma City, OK	
USAESOM	1	DDC, Alexandria, VA	1
USAENPG	1	ETS, Princeton, NJ	1